

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,707	04/07/2000	Sundaram Ramakesavan	42390.P8181	1262

7590 07/06/2004

David Kaplan  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/545,707	Applicant(s) RAMAKESAVAN, SUNDARAM	
	Examiner Le Nguyen	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15 and 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15 and 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 5/18/04.
2. Claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 18 are independent claims; claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 18 and 19 have been amended; and claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### *Claim Objections*

4. The use of the trademark Bluetooth has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claims 1, 8 and 18 contain the trademark/trade name Bluetooth. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the

Art Unit: 2174

trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe a protocol developed to wirelessly connect electronic devices via radiowaves and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. Claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al.

("Wagner") in view of Smith et al. ("Smith").

As per claim 1, Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising:

(a) displaying a first list of names of a plurality of electronic devices coupled to the wireless network on a display screen of a first electronic device coupled to the wireless network (fig. 3A, "*Address Book*");

(b) receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device, wherein a broadcast of a wireless identification signal may be sent to multiple electronic devices, the identification signal including a first default name assigned by a user of the second electronic device (col. 6, lines 40-41; *an identification signal such as a telephone number that is unfamiliar to the user of the first device appears in the display screen*; col. 6, lines 24-45; col. 8, lines 22-24 and lines 49-54; *i.e. users may send messages to multiple electronic devices*); and

(c) providing an option on the first electronic device to rename the default name associated with the second electronic device to a local name (col. 4, lines 55-58; *user may access*

*various functions of a telephone address book such as inherent functions of editing/renaming an address book).*

However, Wagner does not explicitly disclose that a broadcast of a wireless identification signal may be sent to multiple electronic devices from the second electronic device. Official Notice is given that broadcast of a wireless identification signal being sent to multiple electronic devices from a second electronic device is well known in the art as is the case if Wagner's second electronic device also uses Wagner's teaching of broadcasting a wireless identification signal to multiple electronic devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include a broadcast of a wireless identification signal being sent to multiple electronic devices from the second electronic devices to Wagner's broadcast of a wireless identification signal being sent to multiple electronic devices in order to provide users with a method to communicate with a plurality of users. Although the modified Wagner teaches displaying a visual cue on the display screen, in response to receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device, wherein a broadcast of a wireless identification signal being sent to multiple electronic devices, the cue identifying a default name associated with the second electronic device in the first list of names of electronic devices (col. 6, lines 40-41), Wagner still does not explicitly disclose a visual cue displayed on the display screen identifying a second default name associated with the second electronic device in the first list of names of electronic devices in response to the first electronic device being incapable of translating the first default name. Smith teaches a visual cue displayed on the display screen identifying a second default name associated with the second electronic device in the first list of names of electronic devices in response to the first electronic device being incapable of

translating the first default name (col. 12, lines 38-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Smith's visual cue displayed on the display screen identifying a second default name associated with the second electronic device in the first list of names of electronic devices in response to the first electronic device being incapable of translating the first default name to Wagner's display of a visual cue on the display screen, in response to receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device, wherein a broadcast of a wireless identification signal being sent to multiple electronic devices, the cue identifying a default name associated with the second electronic device in the first list of names of electronic devices in order to provide a user a way of quickly identifying a signal when only part of the signal's data is known.

As per claim 2, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to broadcast a wireless identification signal from the first electronic device to the multiple electronic devices, including the second electronic device the identification signal including a first default name assigned by a user of the first electronic device; in response to the second electronic device unable to translate the first default name, displaying a visual cue on the display screen of the second device the cue identifying a second default name associated with the first electronic device in a second list of names of a plurality of electronic devices coupled to the wireless network (Smith: col. 12, lines 38-48).

As per claim 3, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to broadcast a wireless activation signal to a user-selected electronic device from the first list of names of electronic devices, the activation signal to cause the user-selected electronic device to identify itself using an audio or visual cue

Art Unit: 2174

(Wagner: figs. 3A and 4; *upon receiving a signal from another electronic device, a visual cue "Sue Smith" is displayed*).

As per claim 4, Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to broadcast a wireless activation signal to multiple user-selected electronic devices from the first list of names of electronic devices, the activation signal to cause the user-selected electronic devices to identify themselves using an audio or visual cue (figs. 3A and 4; *upon receiving a signal from another electronic device, a visual cue "Sue Smith" is displayed*).

As per claim 5, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising providing a data exchange option on the first electronic device to send a file to the second electronic device, the data exchange option identifying the second electronic device by the local name (Wagner: *see figs. 5, 8 and respective portions of the specification; stock information and stock quotes are sent in batch files over the wireless networking device*).

As per claim 6, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network wherein displaying the first list of names is done in response to a user of the first electronic device selecting a wireless network mapping menu option (Wagner: fig 3A; *selecting an address book*).

Claim 7 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 8 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 4 and 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 9 is similar in scope to claim 1(b) and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.



Art Unit: 2174

Claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 1(c) and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 2 and 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Inquires***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê whose telephone number is (703) 305-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm (EST).

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN  
Patent Examiner  
June 24, 2004

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100